MINUTES OF THE HERITAGE PRESERVATION COMMISSION

CITY OF SAINT PAUL, MINNESOTA

Lower Level – Room 41, City Hall/Court House, 15 West Kellogg Boulevard March 24, 2011

Present: Richard Dana, Robert Laffin, Jennifer Haskamp, Matt Hill, Rich Laffin, John Manning, Lee Meyer, David Riehle, Mark Thomas, Steve Trimble, Diane Trout-Oertel, Richard Ferguson

Absent: Renee Hutter (excused), Matt Mazanec (excused),

Staff Present: Amy Spong

BUSINESS MEETING

CALL TO ORDER: 5:10 PM by John Manning (Chair)

I. APPROVAL OF THE AGENDA: The agenda was approved as presented.

(Riehle, Thomas)

II. CONFLICT OF INTEREST: None were stated

III. CHAIR'S ANNOUNCEMENTS: There were no announcements.

IV. STAFF ANNOUNCEMENTS:

Staff announced Commissioner Lee Meyer stepped down from the Commission. He filled one of the three required Registered Architect positions, so they will be moving forward to find a replacement. Second announcement was about the April 6 public hearing for the Victoria Theatre designation. All of the notices have gone out. The hearing starts at 5:30. The Central Corridor public hearing is on the same night.

V. OLD BUSINESS: None

VI. PUBLIC HEARINGS:

A. Jacob Schmidt Brewing Company Historic District, generally bounded by Jefferson Avenue on the north, Oneida and Erie Streets on the east, James Avenue on the south, and Toronto Street on the west, Public Hearing to consider the district and accompanying Preservation Program a Saint Paul Heritage Preservation Site and make a recommendation to the City Council. (Spong, 266-6714).

Commissioner Dana said that the St. Paul City Council met the night before and reached the capacity of the HRA to approve \$1.9 in seed money funding as a loan. Staff said that the purpose of the staff report is to consider the local designation of the Schmidt Brewing Company Historic District as a heritage preservation site. They said they had the seven criteria that are in the city ordinance for how the Commission is to consider which districts are worthy of designation. The staff report also cites the ordinance for Planning Commission review and their resolution – they have done both the neighborhood planning committee and made a recommendation to the Planning Commission. Staff is also required both by the ordinance and by the contract that we have with the state Historic Preservation Office to submit all local nominations to the state historical society. Staff submitted that on March 3rd and they have a 60 day comment period. This is the third major step in the process. Staff passed around timeline, which has been modified a little bit, for how they are anticipating final designation. After the hearing the staff will be making a recommendation, however, the next general step is to go in front of the City Council with the recommendation. The city council adoption process is, by ordinance, four readings. The third reading is another public hearing in front of the city council. Before staff can schedule the ordinance adoption process in front the Council, the

Commission still needs to hear from SHPO and get their comments, and anything that might come forward from testimony during this public hearing or that staff receives. The staff report includes a lot on how the district came to be and the comprehensive survey of 1983 that did complete a thematic National Register nomination, and jumping to 2004 when Andrew Hine who lives in the neighborhood was one of the first people to gather a lot of the documentation and submitted a formal large document to the SHPO which is where the preservation office determined that this district was eligible for designation and they suggested the boundaries at that time – so in 2004 the boundaries were suggested for moving forward as a local and National register District. In 2005, the Fort Road Federation hired Paul Clifford Larson to complete the designation study which further established the significance and the boundaries for the historic district. In April 2010. Council Member Thune requested that the St. Paul HPC initiate the local designation process for this district. The HPC received a \$7,000 Legacy Grant to hire Paul Larson to complete the register nomination. Staff Spong reviewed the findings from the Staff Report, including support of the designation by the Planning Commission, and pending comments on the nomination form from the SHPO. Staff Spong continued with a description of the proposed historic district from the nomination form, followed by an excerpt from the staff recommendation. Staff Spong suggested a modified staff recommendation to close the oral testimony portion following the public hearing, but leave the written testimony open for a determined period of time, including a design review committee to take in the written testimony and present findings in front of the Commission. Staff Spong proceeded to exhibit and clarify slide images of the Schmidt Brewery. Commissioner Laffin asked Staff Spong to clarify between the local designation criteria and the national register criteria, and confirm the number of single-family residential houses in the proposed district. Commissioner Trout-Oertel asked staff for clarification of the end date of the period of significance. Staff agreed that clarification of the period of significance was needed in the nomination form, and should be part of the motion. Commissioner Laffin then opened the public hearing for testimonies.

Mr. Dave Bredemus approached the Commission and said that he grew up next to the brewery and was a history teacher for 21 years. He is currently the president of the West Seventh/Forth Road Federation. Mr. Bredemus asked the HPC to expand the district two city lots to include four houses on Eerie Street which have tremendous significance to the district. He said that all four homes are 19th century homes based on city permits, and that those homes tell the story of what happened at the brewery, specifically the workers. He claims that the 1905 census shows interesting data that might prove the significance of the homes. In 1910, one of the homes had 14 German immigrants living there; about half of those homes had people working at the brewery at that time. A German brewer lived in one of the homes, a couple laborers, a contractor, a bookkeeper, and a cooper. Another resident was had his citizenship papers signed by Charles Lauer, who was involved in building the brewery, he laid the foundation for the building. There was also an engineer from New York. A family named Schmidt lived there with four children at one time. The homes will help tell the story of the brewery. What might happen in terms of new development if the home isn't protected? The age fits the criteria more so than other homes that are listed in the district. There is a District Council resolution that supports this option. Mr. Bredemus shared an 1874 plat mat, which shows that Cascade Creeks once ran through those four properties.

Mr. Andrew Hine approached the Commission. He said that he lives near brewery, and thought the district was going to include the entire brewery town neighborhood, and is surprised by the tight boundaries. He said he was thinking about Schells

Brewery which has a little museum that holds a lot of memorabilia. Met with Dave Davis who has a lot of stuff, and has two Charles Hausler drawings. Working on digitizing his own records, hopefully Paul Clifford will as well. He is curious about contact with stable owners and Re-Entry Services, Inc., and all other private property owners (9-15). Next to 15, at the corner used to be a Platteville building, there might be room there if anyone wants to move a building to it in the future. Mr. Bard said the success of the northern part without any oversight is testimony to the neighbor's concern for history, and that includes Eerie, Duke, and Colborne, and left to their own devises they know how to make a good neighborhood. He asks for leniency, and encourages the HPC to go and knock on doors. Down in the cellar beneath the office building there is a bottom of a stairway that is filled with Platteville blocks, and he is convinced that they are blocks from the former office building and hopes that they can be cleaned out to figure out what they are, as well as thinking about all the dirt in the cellars themselves. Mr. Hine said that the office front door on West Seventh Street has been replaced, and believes that the original should be saved.

Paul Bard approached the Commission and said that in regards to the expansion of the district, he would welcome it. He said he lives at 359 Duke Street. His house was built and lived in by an architect who worked on the Great Northern Railroad. He said that a lot of people have an interest in the history of the larger area. There is also a mansion on Duke Street that has been restored to three condos. Mr. Bard noted that Mary Wingerd, who wrote *Claiming the City*, lives on Duke Street. He asked that the HPC explore the possibility of expanding the district.

Commissioner Laffin closed the oral portion of the public hearing and asked Staff Spong if there was written testimony to share. Staff Spong said that there were two brief written testimonies, and clarified to the Commission that current homeowners within the proposed district boundaries were sent form letters that they could fill out and that only one was returned. Staff Spong shared the contents of the form letter and of one other testimony. Commissioner Laffin asked staff about extending period for written testimony. Staff Spong responded that because staff just finished putting the preservation program together the public didn't have enough time to go through it. Commissioner Laffin asked Staff Spong how long she'd like to keep the written portion open. Staff Spong explained that the designation has been on a very tight timeline, and that a developer has been looking to acquire the main brew house and bottling house and they wish to obtain the state and federal in order to do that. Staff explained the two different ways a developer and owner can obtain those tax credits. Staff said that a motion to layover the decision would give the developers more time to look at the guidelines and provide written comments to the Commission for consideration. Staff said that it would also give more time to potentially meet with property owners with reservations. Commissioner (45:22) asked about the reopening of Webster. Staff responded that it was the current plan to reopen Webster by removing an existing wall and Building 22 of the former ethanol plant to realign the grid.

Commissioner Riehle thanked Mr. Bredemus for providing the information regarding the four workers' houses. He said that there was typically a disconnect between the architecturally significance and the human context. He also added that the Omaha Railroad provided rail service to the brewery, carrying grain, bottles, and shipments. He said it is Important to acknowledge the roll of the railroad as an employer and the workers as part of the human fabric. Commissioner Thomas acknowledged the presence of Cascade Creek, and said it was important to identify if the initial siting of the brewery was originally dependent on water or power from the creek.

Commissioner Trout-Oertel said that she was in favor of looking into the history more. Commissioner Trimble said he was also in favor of looking into it as well, but also that houses within the larger neighborhood should be considered. Commissioner Laffin asked if there were costs involved in doing a survey of the neighborhood, and asked staff where that money would come from. Staff Spong replied that the HPC received funding from Legacy Grants, which have not been appropriated for 2011, as well as CLG monies. Commissioner Ferguson asked about the timeline associated with a survey regarding the expansion. Staff Spong said that the decision would have to go back through the Planning Commission and start the time clock over again. Commissioner Haskamp asked if a residential district could be part of a future study. Staff Spong said that it could be part of a study for expanding the district in the future. Commissioner Trimble said that there could be ways to do it, such as through a Master's project, to get the survey done. Commissioner Trout-Oertel asked if it was possible to have two districts, a residential district in addition to the brewery district. Staff Spong said yes, and clarified that there are local districts that had different boundaries in the National Register listing. Commissioner Riehle said that it is important to consider protection of the four houses so that they are not vulnerable to development and demolition. Commissioner Laffin received request and agreed to re-open public hearing.

David Wickiser approached the Commission. He noted that he is on the Planning Commission and Board of Fort Road Federation, and lives at 345 Duke Street. As a neighborhood they have been looking at the context of history and how it works in the area. Not discounting the railroad, Fountain Cave, worker house, and the national park that the history component would have an integral part. It seems like a sensitive issue with regards to the development to go ahead with approving the designation, especially with development concerns. The neighborhood is friendly to expanding the boundaries and enhancing it in every direction. From the developments perspective, delaying it could impact the financing issues and put the whole development in a precarious state. For that reason, he requests that the Commission consider leaving the boundaries as they are today.

Own Metz with Dominium Development approached the Commission. They have moving forward hard and earnest spending a significant dollar amount trying to move it forward and redevelop the two buildings. Any start over of the clock in working with SHPO and NPS could have an impact on Dominium. Shouldn't be the focus of the district and he is in support of the houses, but everyone should be aware of the impact that it could have on delaying the closing.

Commissioner Riehle asked Mr. Bredemus for the status of the four houses. Mr. Bredemus replied that two are rentals, and two are owned. Mr. Bredemus reproached the bench and said that the point was made that these are significant houses and that we need to find a way to make it happen. But the most important thing is that the brewery has to be developed. They don't want to do anything that is going to diminish that from happening. Need an effort made to see how hard it would be to include the houses. If it is going to be process that delays everything and causes problems, that is not what he wants to happen. Must put the brewery piece together or everything will be lost. But if it can be a quick thing to add them and take a look, the research is already there, it should be done. Commissioner Laffin asked for further comments and none replied. He said that the Commission was looking for a motion for possibly a layover to buy more time and establish a design review committee. Commissioner Trimble made the motion, and Commissioner Trout-Oertel seconded the motion. Staff Spong asked to make a

motion to close the oral portion of the public hearing and accept written testimony for an additional week. Commissioner Trimble made the motion, Trout-Oertel seconded the motion. Commissioner Ferguson asked if the Design Committee could be charged with initiating an investigation into what can be done with the four houses and the possibility of expanding the district. Commissioners Riehle, Ferguson, and Trout-Oertel volunteered to staff the Design Review Committee. Commission Laffin motioned to approve the timeline and Design Review Committee, and the motion was passed unanimously.

VII. NEW BUSINESS:

Commissioner Trout-Oertel said that the Commission should clarify topics for the three small retreat groups and that the members should have a chance to choose the group they want to join. Staff Spong clarified that the groups were demo delay, fees, and enforcement. Commissioner Trout-Oertel said she thought it was important to include demo-by-neglect as part of the demolition group. She noted the Commissioner Thomas had started working with community council on a pilot project to explore how commissioners in community councils can work together, and wondered if that could be part of the discussion during the retreat. She said that demolition delay is a given and asked Staff Spong if fees and enforcement were the other two groups. Staff Spong said that they are different and warrant separate discussions - fees aren't used just for enforcement. Commissioner Trout-Oertel asked if the Commission wanted to expand the retreat to include anything else and how do they feel about the other topics, which include demo-by-neglect, education, and collaboration. Staff Spong said that the ordinance was to be the focus because that was a priority of the Education Committee and is part of the work plan for this year as a Commission. She said the idea was that the Commission would separate into groups to focus on the top three major items of the ordinance – which is demo delay or demo neglect, fees, and enforcement. She said that education is not going to be addressed as part of the ordinance re-write, but it can be added on as a separate discussion item, so focus the first part of the retreat on the ordinance and the second part on education. Commission Trout-Oertel agreed that that would be a good way to handle it, but asked if demo-by-neglect would be addressed. Staff Spong said the language was already drafted in the ordinance and that was never challenged by any of the people who reviewed it within City departments. She said she also ordered a new National Park Service publication on doing away with demoby-neglect, which won't arrive on time. Commissioner Trout-Oertel addressed the Education Committee if they were on board with the three groups as planned. Commissioner Ferguson said that he agreed in regards to the ordinance, but that he would like to have some discussion on education and collaboration, though it doesn't need to take a lot of time and doesn't need to be separate discussion groups. Commissioner Laffin said that both things could be discussed. Commissioner Trout-Oertel asked if staff wanted to take over the agenda and alter it accordingly. Staff Spong said she would send out a revised draft agenda to the Education and Executive Committees and everyone could respond with input via email. Commissioner Trout-Oertel asked staff to send out the materials in advance. Commissioner Laffin asked members to share which groups they'd like to be assigned to. Commissioner Riehle said he would like to discuss demolition-bynealect. Staff Spong clarified that the revised ordinance refers to demo-by-nealect as duty-to-maintain. Commissioner Trout-Oertel suggested that the small group on enforcement discuss duty-to-maintain. Staff Spong said that it was more of a fine than a fee, but could be discussed under enforcement.

VIII. ADJOURN: 7:10